

Sinclair Broadcasting's decision to force their stations to air an anti-Kerry documentary, without also airing in an equally high profile time slot a Pro-Kerry documentary, days before the election is a clear example of the dangers of media not being required to show both sides of an issue equally, thereby showing the goodwill of that particular station to be in support of that particular stance. This is deceptively false support of one stance and not truth in reporting the issues during a campaign.

Sinclair uses the public airwaves free of charge, and is obligated by law to serve the public interest, not sway it by showing only one side. But when large companies control the airwaves, we get more of what's good for their bottom line and less of what we need for our democracy. We need truth in media reporting, not slanted, one sided programing from a station that thinks they have more money and power than anyone else so they are allowed to do what they want, when they want, with no accountability.

Sinclair's actions show why we need to strengthen media ownership rules, not weaken them. They show why the license renewal process needs to involve more than a returned postcard. Thank you.